# **Single Family Design Guidelines Update Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Update**

## **Steering Committee**

Meeting #7 Notes August 30, 2004

**Steering Committee members**: Chair Dianne Channing, Vice Chair Brian Barnwell, Bruce Bartlett, Joe Guzzardi, Grant House (attending for Bill Mahan), Vadim Hsu, Charmaine Jacobs, Richard Six.

**Staff**: Jaime Limón (Supervising Planner), Heather Baker (Project Planner), Jason Smart (Intern), Dave Hochart (Intern).

#### I. Welcome and Introductions

## II. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda None.

#### **III.** Administrative Items

### IV. Floor to Lot Area Ratio (FAR) & Lot Coverage Options

Staff presentation of Issue Paper D, Part I, was followed by Steering Committee questions and public comment. Public comment is summarized as follows:

Eric Schott: FARs would help to prevent neighborhood disagreements over home size.

**Luis Perez**: Mesa resident. FARs would be too restrictive and would lower property values. Neighborhood compatibility standards change. Median home size may be a good standard. Design matters; well-designed homes could be allowed additional square footage. Garages and other non-living areas should not be included in FAR calculations.

**Tom Williams**: Alta Mesa resident. Present guidelines are adequate. FARs are too restrictive. The NPO/Single Family Design Guidelines Update needs to reflect the opinions of a majority of City residents, not just meeting attendees. One-size-fits-all FARs would be a disservice to some neighborhoods. Alta Mesa is different from the rest of the Mesa. Basements and attics should not be included in FAR calculations.

**Karen Fryklund**: Current guidelines are sufficient. Eclectic neighborhoods are desirable. Modern families need more space. Only living area should count toward FAR.

Wesley Brown: East San Roque resident. Limits such as first- to second-floor ratios are needed to preserve mountain views. A maximum FAR for each neighborhood would permit diversity and creativity in design. Built-out homes should automatically trigger ABR review. Creative parking solutions such as tandem parking are needed.

**Jim Buckley:** Marine Terrace resident. Rules are necessary to preserve neighborhoods. Large homes impact the entire neighborhood. Improvements to houses that are not compatible with the neighborhood do not improve property values. People want rather than need large homes.

**William Hazard:** Mesa resident. The community should develop gradually. Residents who use their garage for storage use on-street parking; incentives for off-street parking are needed. Lot coverage requirements would result in large upper stories. Other seaside communities such as Pismo Beach have small lots and large FARs.

**Joe Cantrell**: Marine Terrace Preservation Group representative. FARs would define acceptability, create regulatory certainty and allow the ABR to focus on design.

**Scott Armstrong**: Mesa resident. Relatively small increases in square footage are difficult to visualize from outside a home, but are significantly beneficial for residents inside. Regulations must be user-friendly and easy to calculate. Maximum FAR limits should be no lower than .44; .46 may be adequate.

**Lisa Burns**: Upper Eastside resident; collected information from title companies and the County Assessor to study FARs in her neighborhood and concluded that small lots need restrictive FARs. Second stories are the largest source of neighborhood incompatibility. The first house in a neighborhood to add a second story should receive ABR scrutiny.

**Cathy McCammon**: League of Woman Voters and La Mesa Neighborhood Association representative. The City of Goleta's FAR requirements seem adequate. Setbacks alone do not solve size problems. People who want larger homes should relocate rather than impose on others. Single-family home regulations are needed in multi-family neighborhoods.

**Jeff Seawards**: Fair Acres resident. Neighborhood compatibility is difficult to measure and achieve because of the diversity of architectural styles and construction dates within neighborhoods. Garage use requirements need to be enforced. FAR or lot coverage compatibility requirements would penalize the first homeowner to remodel. A master plan would be better than gradual change.

**Jason Dodd**: Marine Terrace resident. FARs are an integral component of the NPO Update and would set expectations. The ABR should not have to enforce home size. A single FAR would unite the community. Creating FARs may be difficult but is necessary.

Naomi Kovacs: Current NPO is subjective and inadequate. Clear-cut rules are needed.

**Bryan Smith**: Marine Terrace resident. The current NPO process is adequate. A .44 FAR may be acceptable. FARs are not sufficiently understood by some of the public.

**Ken Fahn**: Marine Terrace resident. Homes in the Mesa are in need of remodeling. Homebuyers expect flexibility; home size restrictions would lower property values. A 2,000 square-foot limit is too restrictive. Many two-story homes are adequately designed. Square footage could be an ABR trigger.

Nancy Ferguson: The volume of cut and fill relative to lot size could be regulated.

A staff presentation of Issue Paper D, Part II: Calculation Considerations was followed by further public comment:

**Karl Eberhard**: Architect. Good design cannot be codified. The process of calculating and providing FAR information would be overly difficult for residents.

Wesley Brown: FARs have been successfully implemented in other jurisdictions.

**Gary Vandeman**: Home size affects quality of life by burdening roads and utilities. FAR requirements should not include exceptions.

#### V. Review Upcoming Schedule

**Motion** (by Charmaine Jacobs): The Steering Committee will meet in the David Gebhard Room on September 17 at 1:30 p.m.

2nd: Vadim Hsu.

All in favor.

#### VI. Adjourn

## **Speaker Slip Comments**

## 1a: FAR Trigger for ABR Review: Status Quo.

Yes: Remove basement and attic from any calculations.

#### 1b: FAR Trigger for ABR Review: Change Current Trigger.

**Yes:** Raise trigger to approximately 50%.

Maybe: Option 10 should automatically trigger ABR review.

## 2c: FAR & Lot Coverage Maximums Combined.

**Yes:** Getting good designs and neighborhood compatibility are worth a bit more work in the application process.

#### 3: Marine Terrace Neighborhood Preservation Group Proposal.

Yes: Care about your neighbors more than yourself.

**No:** Do not support this measurement of FAR since building includes garage and other non-living areas.

No: Worst idea ever heard of.

## 5: FAR or Lot Coverage Compatibility Requirement.

**Maybe:** Neighborhood compatibility worksheets for floor area would protect neighborhood character while still allowing change.

**No:** Support flexibility. If higher than a certain size, require neighborhood compatibility test, but do not allow variances or modifications.

## 7: FAR Incentives for "Good Design."

**Yes:** If FARs are deemed necessary.

**Yes:** With a maximum FAR by neighborhood, this would permit diversity and creativity in design.

# 8a: Flexibility with One-story Condition: Allow Encroachment upon Minimum Required 1,250 Square Feet of Open Space.

Maybe: Depends on whether porches and garages count in FAR.

### 9c: One Covered & One Uncovered Open Space for Constrained Lots.

Yes: Combine this with Option 2c and adjust FAR to lot size.

#### 10: "Built Out" Home Considerations

Maybe: Such homes would trigger ABR review of plans.

## 11b: Alternatives: Limit Second Stories to a Certain Percentage of First-floor Footprint.

**Yes:** A version of this (CC&R limit) has helped to protect views in the East San Roque neighborhood. Good design might merit bonus points, which would help prevent tall, interrupted walls.

## 11d: Alternatives: Base Requirement on Absolute Floor Area Rather than a Percentage of Lot.

No: Would allow huge houses on larger lot in neighborhoods of small lots.

#### 12: Steering Committee Crafted.

Yes: The Steering Committee should meld best elements from these possibilities.